

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 7-9 and 25 are amended without prejudice or disclaimer.

Objection to Claims 7-10

The Office Action objects to claims 7-10 because of informalities. Applicants have corrected claims 7-10 to be dependent upon claim 3 and request withdrawal of this objection.

Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 7-18, 25 and 27-28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 7-18, 25 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,208) (“Dutta”) in view of Narendran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,070,191) (“Narendran et al.”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the primary reference of Dutta fails to teach the concept of rewriting a pointer before serving the content to the client. Applicants shall discuss each portion cited in the Office Action.

First, columns 4 and 5 cited in the Office Action teach away from the present invention inasmuch as they explain that once the user clicks on the hyperlink within the displayed HTML file, the request is sent to the content producer server to provide the document referenced by the hyperlink. Only after this service is there any modification of the HTML file. Specifically, the reference states “once the document is retrieved by the web client 112, the content producer server 116 may then modify the HTML file on the content distribution server 104 containing the hyperlink to the document.” Column 4, lines 63-66. Therefore, clearly, Applicants submit that this teaches away from the present invention by only discussing modifying the HTML file after the document is retrieved by the web client. Column 8 provides little if any additional support to for the Examiner’s position. Here, they explain that when the user selects a hyperlink, the

content producer server maps to the document D and returns the document to the client. The content producer server also maps the document D to a new URL and modifies the file so that the hyperlink points to the new content distribution server. See column 8, lines 38-46. Here, it is clear that the teaching is that the document is sent first to the client and then the document D is mapped to a new URL. Applicants simply submit that the present approach recited in claim 3 requires the rewriting of the pointer before the serving of the content to the client.

To further clarify this point, Applicants have amended claim 3 to recite that the client is redirected to the chosen content distribution network by rewriting a pointer embedded in a document as a rewritten pointer before serving the content to the client so that the content request will be served by the chosen content distribution network as indicated by the rewritten pointer. Thus, Applicants submit that the reference clearly teaches away from this approach. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

Applicants, inasmuch as the primary reference fails to teach each limitation of the claims, Applicants do not address at this time whether it would be obvious of one of skill in the art to combine Dutta with Narendran et al. Applicants reserve the right to argue that the combination is inappropriate.

Claims 4 and 7-18 each depend from claim 3 and recite further limitations therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claim 25 is amended in a similar manner to claim 3 and therefore the arguments above relative to claim 3 apply equally to claim 25. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 25 and dependent claims 27-28 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Novak, Druce & Quigg, LLP, Account No. 14-1437** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2008

By: 

Correspondence Address:

Thomas A. Restaino
Reg. No. 33,444
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Thomas M. Isaacson

Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433